

### REMARKS

The Examiner has required a Restriction Requirement between six alleged groups identified by the Examiner.

MPEP §803 requires that the Examiner indicate that the inventions are either independent or distinct. Also, if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

Here, the Examiner has neither indicated that the species are independent or distinct. The Examiner has failed to show that any more than one search will be required. The claims relate to a horizontal portion of an L-shaped terminal piece secured to a flat plate-like circuit body. Applicants believe that the Examiner will find all of these alleged species during his search. Accordingly, the Examiner must search all alleged species since no serious burden exists.


In the event that the Examiner disagrees with the Applicants' position, Applicants elect Group I, Figure 1, which relates to claims 1, 2, 5 and 6.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 23, 2004

By:

  
W. R. Duke Taylor  
Reg. No. 31,306

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600  
WRDT/jp